United Nations A/C.1/51/PV.23

# General Assembly

Official Records

Fifty-first session

First Committee

23rd Meeting

Thursday, 14 November 1996, 3 p.m.

New York

*Chairman*: Mr. Sychou ..... (Belarus)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.*

**Agenda items 60, 61 and 63-81** *(continued)*

**Action on draft resolutions submitted on all disarmament and international security agenda items**

**The Chairman:** The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in clusters 6, 7 and 8.

The Committee will first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, contained in cluster 6 on outer space (disarmament aspects).

I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to explain the vote of his delegation before the voting.

**Mr. King** (United States of America): The United States will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", for several reasons, the most important of which is the language in operative paragraph 6 which requests the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee with a negotiating mandate to conclude an agreement or agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space.

This draft resolution once again suffers from a key conceptual weakness. It neglects the simple fact that there is no arms race in outer space. This success story can be directly attributed to the legal agreements already in existence. Those same agreements also serve to prevent a future arms race. Consequently, the negotiation of additional agreements is quite simply not required.

Accordingly, we do not agree either with the thirteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs or with operative paragraph 6 regarding the need to establish negotiations on the prevention of some hypothetical arms race in outer space. Therefore, we will call for separate paragraph votes and will vote "no" on the seventeenth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 6, since these paragraphs call for such negotiations.

Further, we cannot "regret" the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in 1996, as stated in the eleventh preambular paragraph. On the contrary, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament showed good judgement by not doing so.

Allow me to note with satisfaction the revised language in paragraph 8. If there is a need for such negotiations, the United States is certainly willing to keep the Conference on Disarmament informed, as appropriate. On the other hand, the recent revision to the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which frets about the weaponization of outer space, simply has no basis in reality.

An American astronaut recently set an outer space endurance record, and did so in a Russian spacecraft. Far from being in an incipient arms race, we are in an era of unprecedented cooperation in space. Thus, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43 remains mired in the cold-war past. Let us move on to real issues. There can be no benefit to negotiating hypothetical treaties to counter a non-existent threat.

96-86816 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate votes have been requested on the seventeenth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 6.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution and those which appear in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, it is also sponsored by India and Chile.

I would like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the thirteenth preambular paragraph. The following phrase should be added to the end of that paragraph: "including the weaponization of outer space".

We shall now proceed to take action on the seventeenth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*The seventeenth preambular paragraph was retained by 85 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar, Nigeria and the United Arab Emirates informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:
United States of America

*Abstaining*:
Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Paragraph 6 was retained by 87 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar, Nigeria and the United Arab Emirates informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:
Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:
None

*Abstaining*:
Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, as a whole, was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 40 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Nigeria informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery": draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, L.5/Rev.1, L.8, L.10, L.25, L.26/Rev.1 and L.32. In this connection, I would like to inform members of the Committee that at the request of the sponsors, action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.1 has been deferred to a later stage.

I now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7.

**Mr. Purbo** (Indonesia): I should like to comment briefly on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10. The importance of regional conferences, seminars and workshops on disarmament and security, with the participation of officials, scholars, academics, journalists and research institutes, cannot be overemphasized. As the repository of experience and expertise on this issue for more than half a century, the United Nations can, upon the request of the countries concerned, render assistance for regional initiatives. The regional approach, in the view of my

delegation, has been effective. Our hope is that through such an approach negotiations can be focused on important priorities related to the strengthening of the security of the countries involved and to the reduction of armaments.

In this context, the importance of the continued operation and functioning of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific in Kathmandu is self-evident. The Centre has given practical expression to the concept of a regional approach to disarmament, in both its nuclear and its conventional aspects. The Centre's primary task of assisting the States involved to deal with emerging issues of concern, stimulate new initiatives and explore fresh approaches to disarmament remains largely unfulfilled. My delegation therefore calls for the continuation of its activities.

**Mr. Hussin** (Malaysia): My delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation to the delegation of Mongolia and to the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10, "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". My delegation is happy to join in sponsoring the draft resolution and hopes that the Committee will adopt it by consensus, as was the case with a similar text last year.

The existence of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament has contributed a great deal to fostering a climate of cooperation and disarmament, which enhances the process of confidence-building in our region. Following the changes in the international environment after the end of the cold war, the existence of the Centre has become more valid and relevant.

Malaysia is honoured to have been invited to participate in the regional dialogue promoted by the Regional Centre, which has come to be known as the Kathmandu Process. We hope that our active participation in this process has contributed to the aims and objectives of the Regional Centre. It is also our hope to see the Centre continue to carry out its activities with adequate support from the United Nations and from countries in Asia and the Pacific region.

In order to promote the expanded activities of the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific, Malaysia will continue to give its support to the work of the Centre, including exploring the possibility of hosting one of the Centre's activities in the near future. Our intention is to continue to contribute in our own small way to the process of disarmament and confidence-building in our region.

**Mr. Guillén** (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Committee is about to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 7, which contains a number of draft resolutions, including two on Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament, one in Asia and the Pacific and one in Africa. My delegation welcomes those draft resolutions, with which we feel a special solidarity.

However, I would like to inform the Committee that this year Peru will not submit a draft resolution on the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament headquartered in Lima, which has authority and jurisdiction over the entire Latin American region. This is because the Centre's future activities, which are temporarily suspended, will have to be carried out on the basis of voluntary contributions. I wish, nevertheless, to make it very clear that a Regional Centre of the same importance as those mentioned in the draft resolutions submitted by my colleagues has been reduced to a state of budgetary asphyxiation, particularly acute at the Lima Centre. Peru, for its part, will do its utmost to continue to pursue these activities.

I would also note that paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 50/71 C, which was adopted by consensus last year, requested consultations between the Secretary-General and the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); these were to be related precisely to the disarmament Centre in Lima. My delegation has requested information from the Secretariat on the action that has been taken on this matter, but we have not as yet received a reply. We would imagine that the workload has made such a response — though not the action — impossible. I would like to take this opportunity to repeat our request to the Secretariat.

We do not believe that regional disarmament activities can be carried out here from New York. We believe that it might be accurate to say that such regional activities are not the concern of New York. They are, however, of great importance for my country, which would like some concrete information. One of the teams of the Regional Centre in my country has been supported by voluntary contributions from a number of Committee members — Mexico, Spain, Sweden and some other countries — and I believe that these teams should not be transferred to any other body headquartered in Peru without the agreement of donor countries and, of course, of my Government. The Government of Peru will continue to strive to ensure that the Lima Centre continues to function and that it is able to perform its duties on a regular basis.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): We had requested additional time from the Secretariat for draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament". I am now told that we have to make that request from the floor. I am therefore doing so now.

**The Chairman:** May I take it that the Committee agrees to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, as requested by the representative of the United States?

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1, "Report of the Disarmament Commission". I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission" was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1996. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the draft resolution.

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the First Committee without a vote.

I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I note that sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 9 of document A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1 reads "to be added". Frankly, my delegation is unable to take a decision when it does not know to what that decision refers. What is involved here? Are we signing a blank cheque? I would suggest that this be deferred until such time as we know.

**The Chairman**: I would like to explain to the members of the Committee that we adopted a similar draft resolution last year, containing a similar paragraph. According to past practice, this text is to be added after the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission.

I call on the representative of Chile on a point of order.

**Mr. Berguño** (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would like to suggest an alternative, just in case it should be useful. Instead of saying "to be added" in sub-paragraph (c), we could move the text of footnote 5 to the body of the draft resolution: that the Disarmament Commission will adopt a decision as to what the third item will be.

In any event, as the Chairman has indicated, this has been our past practice. Mine is just a suggestion for the format. My delegation will not press the point if this does not meet with the approval of the Committee.

**The Chairman**: This text was agreed upon in the course of consultations and I would urge members not to insist on any revisions.

We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their positions.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): You know, Sir, our Mexican colleague had a very good point. I still regret that we did not pursue it further. My delegation decided to suppress our inclination to call for a recorded vote here and to allow the consensus to go forward because of special circumstances; but we would like to state that the United States has concerns about paragraph 9, to which Ambassador de Icaza directed our attention.

This is because, under the guise of a General Assembly resolution, this paragraph suggests that certain decisions have already been taken by the United Nations Disarmament Commission about its agenda. One tends to lose sight of the fact that this is a recommendation of the General Assembly.

And as the representative of Mexico points out, it is just splendid for the General Assembly to be recommending (a), (b), and "to be added". The United States has long been of the conviction that only the Disarmament Commission itself, and not the First Committee or the General Assembly, can make decisions related to the Disarmament Commission's programme of work, its agenda items, the number of agenda items, timing or anything else.

The United States, therefore, would have preferred a draft resolution that left the question of the future agenda to the Disarmament Commission's traditional organizational

session. In other words, our view may be like that of Mexico: that paragraph 9 is simply not needed. Nevertheless, the United States accepted this draft resolution because of the unusual circumstances surrounding the Disarmament Commission activity during this session of the First Committee. We would like to point out the unique nature of this draft resolution and of its paragraph 9, and wish to make it clear that, from our point of view, that paragraph and the draft resolution in its entirety do not set a precedent for the future.

I would like state firmly that the United States takes seriously the commitment expressed by the Chairman and other officers of the Disarmament Commission, that the third agenda item of the 1997 Disarmament Commission agenda, as the footnote in question suggests, will be an item on conventional weapons and be determined at a later date. We understand this item to be part of a package of topics, on which agreement to the parts is dependent on agreement to the whole. If it should turn out at the Disarmament Commission organizational session that there is any resiling on the commitment in this draft resolution that the third agenda item will be on conventional weapons, then as far as we are concerned the whole agenda question will be wide open again.

**Mr. Rivasseau** (France)(*interpretation from French*): France would like to associate itself with what the representative of the United States has just stated.

**The Chairman:** I call on the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission.

**Mr. Hoffmann** (Germany), (Chairman of the Disarmament Commission): I am, of course, relatively new to this disarmament business and therefore am no match for Ambassador Ledogar and his experience. However, during the years I have been here we have always proceeded in the manner the Disarmament Commission has proceeded this year. A final decision on the subject matter for the new item will be taken at the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission scheduled for December of this year.

There was general agreement in my consultations, in the presence of representatives of France and of the United States, that the third item would be an item on conventional weapons. However, we were simply not able to agree on a specific item that morning when we met here for informal consultations. These consultations will continue with the help of Indonesia, and I am confident that a positive decision can be taken as foreseen at the December organizational session.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors have expressed the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8 be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific," was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, Australia has also become a sponsor.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". I call on the representative of India.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): I am sorry to have to ask to speak on the point I am about to make. I would have thought this would have been the job of the Secretariat.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25 was not produced in a revised version for what were apparently financial reasons, even though I find that several revised draft resolutions have been published during this session. A very important correction was made to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25, and our decision on it depends on that particular change being read out at the time it is adopted. The change is set out in document A/C.1/51/INF/2, which the Secretariat circulated instead of a revised version. I think that the Secretariat should try to see that the task of delegations is eased, not complicated.

**The Chairman:** It is my understanding that the Secretary will indeed be reading out the revision to which the representative of India refers. The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996.

It should be noted that the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, as is indicated in document A/C.1/51/INF/2.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Togo, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 7 November 1996.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.32. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.32, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Fellowship, Training and Advisory Services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 7 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, Australia has also become a sponsor.

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.32 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft texts contained in cluster 8, "Other disarmament measures": draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7 and draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.12, L.13, L.14, L.20/Rev.1 and L.34.

I have been informed that the United States has requested that action on draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7 be postponed to a later stage. May I take it that the Committee agrees to that request?

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman**: I now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): I would like to say in advance that when draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12, on disarmament and development, comes up for consideration, the United States will not participate in the action. We will explain afterwards what our problem is.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996.

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): I request that the record of today's proceedings reflect that the United States did not participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12. This draft resolution asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that simply do not lend themselves to being linked, and it was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference referred to in this draft resolution.

We would like to take this opportunity to state that the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of that Conference.

**Mr. O'Rourke** (Ireland): The States members of the European Union have joined in the consensus on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/51/L.12, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", and wish to clarify their understanding of it. While we recognize the considerable benefit that may accrue from disarmament, there is no simple, automatic link between, on the one hand, the European Union's commitments to economic and social development and development cooperation and, on the other hand, savings made in other areas, including disarmament.

At the same time, we would like to underscore the European Union's commitment to development cooperation and to note that assistance provided by the European Union and its member States to developing countries accounts for almost 40 per cent of the global total.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13.

A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13 was adopted by 106 votes to 3, with 35 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Andorra had intended to abstain.]

**The Chairman:** I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): As has been the case with similar texts for the past several years, the United States was compelled again this year to vote against the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Like its predecessors, this draft resolution does not meet even the minimum requirements necessary to warrant our support. Once again, it fails to recognize the navigational rights and freedoms protected under customary international law as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Freedom of overflight and the rights of innocent passage through territorial seas and of transit passage through international straits and archipelagic sea lanes must be explicitly acknowledged, in addition to freedom of navigation on the high seas. Absent such acknowledgement, the United States cannot and will not support any draft resolutions along the lines of this one.

Furthermore, we remain deeply concerned by the financial burden placed on the United Nations by the continued existence of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. In a budgetary environment marked by retrenchment across the board, there is simply no reason for the United Nations to continue to expend scarce resources on a committee whose work could be better done elsewhere. The United Nations cannot afford to support bodies that no longer serve any useful purpose whatsoever. Bluntly put, the Ad Hoc Committee's continued existence is a waste of money — money that could, and should, be put to much better use.

No one denies that issues of security and the peaceful resolution of disputes in the Indian Ocean region are important. The question is how best to address them effectively in a financially responsible manner. The work of the Ad Hoc Committee, such as it is, demonstrates conclusively that the current system is not the way. It is long past time that the States of the region recognized that financial responsibility means addressing issues of security in an appropriate regional forum, not in an obsolete and expensive Ad Hoc Committee.

As the United States noted last year, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is the only such group that meets under the auspices and budget of the United Nations. This should stop. The regional participants should endeavour to identify an appropriate regional forum to which their substantive discussions can be devolved. We hope that next year's draft resolution will be more effective than this year's in accomplishing this important task.

**Ms. Hand** (Australia): Australia is a littoral State of the Indian Ocean, and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13, on implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. At the same time, we are concerned that, despite a recommendation to do so at its 1993 and 1995 sessions, the Ad Hoc Committee has not been able to make concrete progress in agreeing to new alternative approaches to the zone of peace concept. We urge the Committee to make maximum productive use of its 1997 session with a view to recommending to the General Assembly a fresh approach to the development of mechanisms designed to enhance Indian Ocean regional security.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the representative of Colombia on a point of order.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I had understood that no request for a recorded vote had been made. I should therefore like to know, for information, which delegation requested a recorded vote.

**The Chairman:** I am informed by the Secretariat that the delegation of the United States of America requested a recorded vote on this draft resolution.

I call on the representative of the United States.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): Is this the new procedure to be followed in this Committee: when a recorded vote has been requested the Chairman will disclose who specifically requested it? I have no problem with that, but I should like to make use of such an procedure in the future. Is it the norm from now on that it is perfectly legitimate, whenever a recorded vote has been requested, to ask which delegation asked for it?

**The Chairman:** That is indeed the procedure. If the sponsors of a draft resolution make that request, we must disclose the information.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Andorra, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey,

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14 was adopted by 116 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): I will let the other 29 members who apparently also wanted a recorded vote speak for themselves, but let me say on behalf of the United States that, although this draft resolution has been submitted once again, we still do not understand what its purpose is, or what the sponsors hope to achieve by its adoption. One thing that is clear, however, is that the potential effects of this draft resolution could divert us from the productive work in which Governments are already engaged in regional arms control and disarmament agreements and, instead, have us focus on drawing up vague environmental norms. For example, the draft resolution calls upon the States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction to take into account

> "the necessity of ensuring the preservation of the environment". (*A/C.1/51/L.14, eleventh preambular para.*)

Any effort to introduce a new dimension into the ongoing negotiations on the Convention at this late hour is unhelpful and unwelcome.

It goes without saying that no one opposes the protection of the environment. Clearly, such concerns, when relevant, would appropriately be taken into account

in the implementation of arms control agreements. For its part, the United States has stringent environmental legislation that requires the preparation of environmental impact statements in a variety of situations, such as the removal of missiles from silos or the destruction of chemical weapons.

In our explanation of vote on the draft resolution on this same item last year, we noted that it selectively singled out certain arms control and disarmament agreements, whether completed or under negotiation, and that in doing so it took many of them out of context. Unfortunately, the laundry list of treaties in this year's draft resolution has grown substantially longer and is even more objectionable.

Moreover, the draft resolution is also apparently intended to function as a cookbook of sorts, because document A/C.1/51/L.14 now includes recipes for technology transfer and application, for sustainable development and for the peaceful use of outer space.

This confusion over purpose permeates the entire text. For example, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14 also states, in paragraph 1, that in the negotiation of arms control agreements, these agreements should ensure the strict observance of the relevant environmental norms. My delegation thought that the objective of our work here was to reach agreements on the control, reduction and/or elimination of arms, not to ensure compliance with environmental norms. In short, we strongly support efforts to protect the environment. We question, however, the purpose and utility of this draft resolution.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of India at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors contained in the draft resolution and those appearing in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, it has also been sponsored by Pakistan.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Georgia, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Ukraine, Uruguay

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted by 81 votes to 39, with 22 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** I now call on the representative of China, who wishes to explain the vote of his delegation after the voting.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1, on the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament. The Chinese delegation has always supported

such draft resolutions, for the following reasons: first, we support the promotion of international cooperation for the peaceful uses of science and technology so that they can accelerate the economic and social development of countries, particularly the developing countries. Secondly, export control regimes on dual-use goods and technologies should be set up with the universal participation of the international community.

At the same time, the Chinese delegation wishes to point out that we are concerned at the potential negative impact that the military application of science and technology can have on international peace and security. Of the three main categories of weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons have already been banned. Improving or upgrading these two categories of weapons through the military application of science and technology is illegal for countries that have signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

With the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) relating to another category of weapons of mass destruction — nuclear weapons — improvement of these weapons too will be severely restricted. Upgrading this category of weapons is now almost impossible. This is one of the reasons why the conclusion of the CTBT was so important. China is not only concerned at the application of advanced science and technology to the development of weapons of mass destruction; we are equally, indeed more, concerned at the use of science and technology in the development of outer space weapons, and weapons systems such as the so-called theatre missile defence. In this sense the military application of science and technology is of equal importance to conventional weapons and to weapons of mass destruction. For this reason, we believe that the language in the second preambular paragraph of this draft resolution is clearly unbalanced.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): We have just adopted a draft resolution which bears the same title as the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.34. However, the approach of the latter draft resolution is almost diametrically opposed to that of the one we have just adopted. While we welcome and appreciate the reference made in draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 to the need to enhance bilateral and multilateral dialogue on the role of science and technology in the fields of international security and disarmament, we continue to have reservations on the concepts set out in subparagraphs 1 (a) and 1 (b). We are of the view that the language contained in these paragraphs appears to promote and encourage ad hoc control regimes that are not only non-transparent and discriminatory but also exclusive. Our view on this issue is that, although control of dual-use technology transfers is necessary, these controls should be multilaterally negotiated, non-discriminatory and universally acceptable. Only then will these controls be effective and not amount to trade barriers — which is what they are today — thereby hampering the economic and social development of countries, in particular of developing countries. For these reasons, we are unable to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.34.

**Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation fully subscribes to the statement just made by the representative of India on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields". Our delegation continues to maintain that the transfer of high technology should be regulated only through multilaterally negotiated, non-discriminatory legal instruments and treaties, not ad hoc regimes.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, it is sponsored also by those that appear in document A/C.1/51/INF/3.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia,

Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

Burkina Faso, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Gabon, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Namibia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United States of America

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, which the Committee has just adopted, on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

We abstained on the equivalent draft resolution last year for reasons which we had outlined in our explanation of vote in 1994. We remain committed to a cooperative approach to the issues raised by the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament. We recall our disappointment that the international community was not able to agree on guidelines on this subject in the Disarmament Commission in 1994, despite the tireless efforts of Ambassador Mason of Canada. This was due to the refusal of an ever-dwindling number of delegations to recognize existing legal commitments already undertaken under relevant multilateral treaties and international agreements.

The draft resolution we have just adopted recognizes these commitments and urges all States to accept the responsibilities and commitments they have undertaken under such key treaties as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, all of which address the issue of the transfer of high technology related to weapons of mass destruction.

It is, of course, in full conformity with these legal obligations that a number of countries have put in place and are implementing proper export controls and safeguards against proliferation. The United Kingdom fully supports the principle of greater responsibility and transparency in the transfer of armaments and sensitive dual-use goods. We note that the Wassenaar Arrangement represents a valuable step forward in this area. Such arrangements are effective and transparent. They do not impede the transfer of high technology to the overwhelming majority of the international community. Only those countries with something to hide need fear export controls.

It was in that context that we were prepared to support draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, which should help enhance dialogue and cooperation. But, while we are ready to explore the possibilities offered by further dialogue, we are committed to the key principle recognized by all participants in the Wassenaar Arrangement, that decisions on the export of defence-related equipment are, and must remain, ultimately a matter for national Governments. Any follow-up to the ideas put forward by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 will need to reflect this reality.

**Mr. Benítez** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Our vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.34 reflects, above all, my delegation's sincere willingness to contribute as much as it can to building the necessary consensus so as to ensure that in its future work this Committee may adopt a single draft resolution on this item, reflecting the interests of all delegations.

Given its limited scope, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 is far from fully reflecting Cuba's position on an issue of such importance as that of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament. However, we take the view that the ideas contained in it may be useful in our work towards what, in our view, should be a priority objective on which we should all work together: to begin as soon as possible a multilateral negotiating process with the participation of all interested States, with a view to preparing non-discriminatory and universally accepted guidelines on the international transfer of dual-use and advanced technologies for military purposes.

**Mr. Mesdoua** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): As with similar texts in previous years, my delegation again this year voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34. We hope that the sponsors of these two draft resolutions, A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1 and A/C.1/51/L.34, will in future combine this initiative into a single draft.

**The Chairman:** We are moving along well. We have some time remaining, and I would like to propose that we proceed further by taking action on some of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10. The draft resolution in cluster 9 awaits a report on its budgetary implications. That is why I propose taking action on cluster 10.

If I hear no objection, we shall proceed in the way I have outlined.

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman**: I call on the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

**Mr. Čalovski** (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): On behalf of the delegations of Albania, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Congo, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Zaire and my own delegation, I would like briefly to introduce the revised draft resolution entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States" contained in document A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

In its new operative paragraph 4, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 affirms also the need for strict compliance with the principle of the territorial integrity of any State. All other paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 are the same as in document A/C.1/51/L.42. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42 thus become paragraphs 5 and 6 respectively in the revised text.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 points to one of the basic thrusts of future United Nations activities on the maintenance of international security. Efforts to build a peaceful world, develop national and international cooperation and ensure progress for mankind and economic and social development will not be successful if preventive measures are not continuously taken to combat all forces of war, and all forces leading to the violent disintegration of States. In the coming period, preventive activities and preventive diplomacy, particularly in the field of international security in the disarmament process, will of necessity have a much higher priority than has been the case so far. What has been happening in the last several years, what is happening right now, and what could happen in the future provide more than sufficient grounds for the international community to continue to take preventive measures to combat all forces of destruction. That is the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

The most important prerequisite for the work of the international community is that all States respect and promote all obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and international law in their relations with other States and in the field of international cooperation. So far, we have seen too many violent conflicts, too much human and material destruction. Let us try to prevent new conflicts of that nature from breaking out. Together we can do just that; this will be very important for the success of the disarmament process.

On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, I would like to express the hope that the draft resolution can be adopted without a vote.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico has studied with all due care the draft resolution submitted by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in document A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. We

understand the good intentions behind the draft resolution and the significant problem that it seeks to address. However, the draft resolution places itself in a global context within which references are made, *inter alia*, to certain regional organizations whose statutes do not provide them with jurisdiction in the areas in which they are being requested to take action.

Furthermore, it seems to us that the draft resolution is imbalanced from the legal standpoint, in that it stresses the principle of the territorial integrity of any State, but fails to take account of the principle of the self-determination of peoples. If the draft resolution were to be put to a vote, my delegation would abstain.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): It is China's unswerving belief that all countries should abide by the Charter of the United Nations, the five principles of peaceful coexistence and other basic norms of international relations. Disputes and differences should be settled by peaceful means. The use or threat of use of force should be opposed, as should interference in the internal affairs of other States and infringement upon the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of other States. We understand the considerations behind the submission of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. However, we cannot but point out that we oppose the disintegration of States by any means — whether violent or non-violent. Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 mentions only the violent disintegration of States. This language does not cover the entire picture and is unhelpful. In addition, although we are in favour of developing friendly relations among nations and promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, this is obviously the domain of other committees. The First Committee does not have the mandate or the expertise to discuss human rights issues. It would be inappropriate for us to introduce this issue, which is irrelevant to this Committee, onto our agenda. Therefore, we request a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. The delegation of China will abstain in the vote.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan wishes to commend the delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for its efforts to try and develop a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. As a country which has been subjected to violent disintegration, Pakistan cannot but support the spirit and objectives of this draft resolution. However, there are a number of shortcomings in the text which have prevented us from extending such support to the draft resolution itself.

First, the principle of the territorial integrity of States has always been balanced by reference to the principle of the self-determination of peoples. My delegation would have been happy if the sponsors had been able to insert in this draft resolution a reaffirmation of that principle and a reference to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, where the balance between the principle of territorial integrity and the principle of self-determination has been very carefully negotiated and agreed.

Secondly, we are somewhat concerned that the reference at the end of the fourth preambular paragraph to human rights and fundamental freedoms could be misconstrued by certain quarters in order to promote objectives which are in fact contrary to the stated objectives of this draft resolution and to promote interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. We would have been happier if this reference had been excluded from the draft resolution, or formulated in a more concrete way so as to ensure that the provision could not be misinterpreted or misused in the future for the purpose of interfering in the internal affairs of States.

For these reasons, and despite our very strong sympathy with the objectives of this draft resolution, the delegation of Pakistan will be constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 if it is put to the vote.

**Mr. Broadhead** (New Zealand): I apologize for not speaking on this matter earlier. My delegation does not yet have final instructions on two of the items in cluster 10. The draft resolutions on which we do not have instructions are A/C.1/51/L.22, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", and A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States".

I therefore request that the First Committee defer action on these two draft resolutions until tomorrow.

**The Chairman**: The delegation of New Zealand has requested postponement of action on draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.22 and A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. If I hear no objection I will postpone until tomorrow the taking of action on these two draft resolutions.

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, it is sponsored also by those which appear in document A/C.1/51/INF/3.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions.

**Mr. Yativ** (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on resolution A/C.1/51/L.33. However, my delegation wishes to state our position that all regional security matters pertaining to the Middle East are subject to the peace negotiations in our region. Paragraph 7 of the draft resolution does not take this into account.

**Mr. Moradi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation supports the basic thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33 on the strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. However, we would like to go on record with our reservation on the seventh preambular paragraph, on the Middle East peace process. The Islamic Republic of Iran has a principled position on the Middle East peace process and does not believe that the current process will lead to the fulfilment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people or to the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region.

**The Chairman:** I call on the representative of Sri Lanka on a point of order.

**Mr. Goonetilleke** (Sri Lanka): I have a question to ask of the Secretariat with regard to the fate of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.3. When will the Committee be in a position to take a decision on that draft resolution?

**The Chairman:** I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat.

**Mr. Davinic** (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): I must say that the delegation of Sri Lanka is not the only one that is making inquiries as to the state of affairs with regard to the various draft resolutions which are ready for action but cannot be taken up in the First Committee because a budget implication statement is still pending. As members know, this is not a matter on which the Centre for Disarmament Affairs has final authority. We depend on authorization from the budget office to read out the appropriate statements, and we are still waiting for that authorization. We have made it clear to our colleagues that the Committee is hampered in its work due to late approval of these statements, and we are receiving assurances that they are doing their utmost under strenuous conditions. Hopefully, most of these pending issues will be submitted to the Secretary of the Committee to be presented to the Committee tomorrow.

**Mr. Goonetilleke** (Sir Lanka): There was a specific reason for my asking that question. First, we have to bear in mind that the draft resolution was submitted on 29 October, and it is now 14 November. We recognize the problems faced by the Secretariat, and particularly by the budget office, but my problem is somewhat different: in paragraph 2, a request is made for summary records and other facilities for the NPT Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee. While we are waiting for the budget office to decide whether or not there are budgetary implications for the Organization, I understand that the Committee on Conferences is meeting informally, and it is not sure whether or not there will be a request for summary records for the Preparatory Committee meeting that is to be held next year.

So, unless we adopt this draft resolution as soon as possible, I believe that the Committee on Conferences will have its own difficulties. The least we can do, if it is possible, is to inform the Committee on Conferences that in paragraph 2 there is a request for summary records and other conference facilities. They could then take this request into consideration when they consider the matter.

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I too want to refer to the fate of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3. The Russian Federation, like more than 180 other countries, is a sponsor of that draft

resolution, and we do not really understand why there should be such a delay in adopting it. We are very grateful to Mr. Davinic for his clarification, and we understand full well that he cannot be held responsible for the action, or lack of it, of the budget office. But I think it would be proper for us to receive, at the next meeting, some clarification about the complexities facing the budget office with regard to this draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

**Mr. Davinic** (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): I would like to assure all delegations that we will do our utmost to obtain approval from the budget office so that action can be taken tomorrow. Should we fail to obtain that approval for tomorrow, I will then ask a representative of the budget office to come before the Committee and explain the problem which is causing the delay in approval. I hope this meets with the Committee's acceptance.

**The Chairman:** Only two more meetings of the First Committee remain. However, we must still take action on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, A/C.1/51/L.3, L.27 and L.28/Rev.1; in cluster 2, A/C.1/51/L.48 and L.49; in cluster 5, A/C.1/51/L.15; in cluster 7, A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1 and L.11/Rev.1; in cluster 8, A/C.1/51/L.7; in cluster 9, A/C.1/51/L.38; and in cluster 10, A/C.1/51/L.22 and L.42/Rev.1. I should therefore like to ask the sponsors of those draft resolutions to be ready for the Committee to take action on them tomorrow.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to remind the Committee that, in accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, on Monday, 25 November 1996, the Committee will embark on the last phase of its work — namely, general debate and consideration of and action on draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 62, entitled "Question of Antarctica". In this connection, I invite representatives of those delegations wishing to participate in the general debate on agenda item 62 kindly to place their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

I would also like to remind those delegations wishing to submit draft resolutions under agenda item 62 kindly to adhere to the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions as indicated in the Committee's programme of work and timetable, which is Monday, 18 November 1996, at 6 p.m.

*The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.*

United Nations A/C.1/51/PV.24

# General Assembly
Fifty-first session

*Official Records*

## First Committee
**24**th Meeting
Friday, 15 November 1997, 10 a.m.
New York

*Chairman:* Mr. Sychou ..... (Belarus)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.*

**Agenda items 60, 61 and 63-81** (*continued*)

**Action on draft resolutions submitted on all disarmament and international security agenda items**

**The Chairman:** The Committee will proceed to take action on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.3 and L.27/Rev.1; in cluster 5, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.15, and associated statement A/C.1/51/L.52 on its programme budget implications; in cluster 7, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1; in cluster 8, draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7; in cluster 9, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1; and in cluster 10, draft decision A/C.1/51/L.22 and draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

Requests have been made to defer action on the following draft resolutions until Monday: in cluster 1, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2; in cluster 2, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.48 and L.49; in cluster 7, draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.1. Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions, I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

**Mr. Davinic** (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): Members will recall that in my statement to the Committee yesterday I indicated my intention of raising with the budget office the question of pending financial statements on several resolutions and of reporting this morning on where we stand. I am happy to report that with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3, on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we have clearance from the budget office to proceed with a statement on financial implications, and in order to avoid any confusion we shall put that in writing. However, at this point, in order to enable the Committee to proceed to take action on this particular draft resolution, I should like to state, for the record, that should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997.

Furthermore, I would like to state that, in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.15, an appropriate statement of programme budget implications has been issued and the Committee may take action on that draft resolution in the course of this meeting, should it wish to do so. Finally, I would like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1, entitled, "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures". We have consulted the budget office in order to determine whether this particular draft resolution entails any additional financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations, and we have been informed that that is not the case. I would therefore like to state that in connection with the request contained in this draft resolution, the Secretariat will not incur any additional financial expenditures. If this statement satisfies delegates, the Committee may wish to proceed to take action on that particular draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will take note of the statement of the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

I call on the representative of Egypt to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1 and A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2.

96-86822 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

**Mr. Abdel Aziz** (Egypt): Egypt, on behalf of the Member States of the United Nations that are members of the League of Arab States, yesterday submitted amendments which came out today in document A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1. These amendments were reached during intensive and thorough consultations which took place during the last 10 days. They reflect a positive improvement, from the point of view not only of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but also of other delegations that participated in the elaboration of this text and in our consultations.

The main change from draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.27 is that we merged the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs into the formulation now seen in the new text. I must say that in the eighth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1 there was something omitted which must be added. That preambular paragraph should read:

> "*Concerned about* threats posed to security and stability by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the region".

A last preambular paragraph has also been added. It reads:

> "*Noting* the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and its signature by 132 States, including a number of States in the region," (*A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1, tenth preambular paragraph*).

It has been drawn to our attention that from the grammatical point of view it might be preferable to say

> "Noting the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty by the United Nations General Assembly".

We think that this would make the text clearer by not indicating that the 132 countries were the ones that adopted the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

With regard to operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of A/C.1/51/L.27, they have been merged and now appear as one paragraph, namely paragraph 2 of A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1. In the earlier draft a State had been mentioned by name in these two paragraphs, but this mention by name disappeared. I hope that this change — a drastic one, from our point of view — will lead to positive results with regard to voting on this draft resolution.

In conducting the informal consultations and in working with all the delegations here in the Committee, we were able to reach this language. We hope that this new language — along with the changes which we in our group consider drastic changes from our position last year and from the earlier draft which appeared in A/C.1/51/L.27 — will lead delegations to consider the possibility of voting in favour of this draft resolution when we take it up on Monday, as we propose, instead of today.

The second draft resolution is A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2. The original draft resolution has already been amended by my delegation, resulting in document A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.1, whereby we took three paragraphs out of our original proposal in A/C.1/51/L.28. In A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2 we took out an additional two paragraphs, despite the fact that these two paragraphs were very dear to our hearts. However, they caused one delegation some problems, and we did so in order to work on the basis of consensus on this draft resolution. The paragraphs deleted were the fourth and the eleventh preambular paragraphs of A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.1.

Operative paragraph 4 has been changed. In operative paragraph 4 we returned to the text of operative paragraph 4 of last year's draft resolution, with, I would like to say, slight amendments. Last year's text reads:

> "Notes the importance of the ongoing bilateral Middle East peace negotiations" (*A/C.1/50/L.10, para. 4*).

We took out the word "ongoing" because we cannot say that the bilateral Middle East negotiations are ongoing. Yes, they are going on one track; but they are not going onward. Unfortunately, they are going backwards. We therefore took the word ongoing out. The text thus reads:

> "Notes the importance of the bilateral Middle East negotiations and the multilateral Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security in promoting mutual confidence and security in the Middle East, including the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone". (*A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2*)

The phrase "activities of the" appeared in the previous draft resolution before the word multilateral. We took these words out because the multilateral Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security has not met for the last two years. Therefore, there are no activities of which to take note. This draft resolution covers the period from last year's draft resolution to this year's, and we do not think

that any activities have been taking place. That is why we dropped these words as well.

With these amendments this draft resolution is identical to last year's draft resolution, except for the two slight amendments in operative paragraph 4. This, from our point of view, shows how hard Egypt is working to maintain the consensus on this draft resolution. Some delegations have been saying that Egypt does not want to adopt this draft resolution by consensus. Egypt does want this draft resolution to be adopted by consensus, but it wants it to reflect accurately the factual position on the ground, not a meaningless consensus in which we just repeat whatever happened 10 years ago.

I am sure that Members all noted that when we started negotiations on A/C.1/51/L.28 we had six new paragraphs. This current text does not have any new paragraphs. This supports our view and our aim to achieve consensus on this draft resolution. We hope that we can reach agreement on these amendments. I know that there are still some reservations on operative paragraph 4, but we hope that maybe by the end of the day we will be able to reach some kind of agreed formulation. We will take this draft resolution and adopt it today by consensus.

**The Chairman**: I would like to ask the representative of Egypt to transmit all the amendments to the Secretary of the Committee in order that they may be correctly reflected in the draft resolutions.

Does any delegation wish to make general statements on draft resolutions in cluster 1, namely draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1 and A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2?

**Mr. Yativ** (Israel): I just want to say a few words in response to the introduction by the representative of Egypt of draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1 and A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2.

Regarding A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1, our position now remains as it has been every year. We do not consider any change something that can contribute to a change in our position. We consider the entire draft resolution to be politically motivated, and therefore any change or amendment is not acceptable to us.

I hope that later I will have an opportunity to explain in a more elaborate way our position on this draft resolution, but at this juncture I must emphasize that any change in the draft resolution is unacceptable because the concept of the draft resolution has been, in principle, politically motivated, and this is something Israel cannot accept.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2, today we have a new version, but the new version is still not acceptable because it does not, in our view, reflect the situation in the Middle East. As far as my Government is concerned, the peace process is going on, the negotiations are going on, and no deletion of a word from that draft resolution will bring Israel to consensus on it this year. I would like to repeat our position very clearly: any change in the draft resolution, be it one word or more than one word, will lead Israel not to join the consensus on it this year.

**Mr. Uluçevik** (Turkey): I have just a simple observation with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1. In the seventh preambular paragraph the Committee notes that Djibouti and the United Arab Emirates have become parties to the Treaty and that Oman will become a party at the earliest date. Then, in operative paragraph 1 we welcome the accession of Djibouti to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons on 22 August 1996, as well as the decision of Oman, but we do not welcome the accession of the United Arab Emirates to the Treaty. If there is no particular reason for not mentioning the United Arab Emirates, then we should amend the draft resolution to do so.

If it is only a simple omission, I propose that, after the word "Djibouti" we add the words "and the United Arab Emirates" and continue "to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" and so on. Since I am not aware of the date of accession of the United Arab Emirates, I am not in a position to propose the inclusion of that information.

**Mr. Abdel Aziz** (Egypt): First, the remarks of the representative of Israel are not strange to me, so I shall not comment on them at this stage.

Secondly, with regard to the remark just made by the representative of Turkey, in fact the welcome here in operative paragraph 1 is limited to Djibouti and the intention of Oman because last year's draft resolution had already welcomed the accession of the United Arab Emirates. However, we have no objection at all if the representative of Turkey wishes to insert the United Arab Emirates again. The more we welcome it the more appreciated it is, and we could accept that proposal.

**The Chairman:** I think that problem is resolved.

I should like to inform the Committee that there has been a request to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.1 until Monday. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to do so.

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** If there are no general statements or explanations of vote before the voting, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3, "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 2000 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee," was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka on behalf of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 6 November 1996.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

India, Israel

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3 was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): I think the Committee is aware of our position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It has been a consistent position, and we continue to maintain it. In keeping with this position, we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3.

Even though the draft resolution appears to be a purely procedural one, we find that, while States parties to an inter-governmental agreement are free to pursue its processes within the forum of that agreement, it is extremely difficult to accept that the provisions and processes of that agreement should become legal tender in the United Nations through a separate resolution.

We understand from the introduction of this draft resolution that its main purpose is to fix a date for the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee. However, we do not believe that a resolution of the General Assembly is necessary for this purpose. The same purpose could well be served by an agreement among the States parties to the Treaty. It is our perception, therefore, that this draft resolution seeks to enhance the status of the provisions and processes of the NPT, a Treaty to which we are opposed and continue to remain opposed, for fundamental reasons.

However, since the sponsors have been careful to address their concerns only to the States parties to the NPT, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

We also welcome the clarification by the lead sponsor and by the Secretariat this morning that the request for assistance from the Secretary-General contained in operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution does not have any financial implications for the membership of the United Nations.

**Mr. Al-Hariri** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We voted in favour of the draft resolution introduced by the lead sponsor, Sri Lanka, entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee".

My delegation feels that the indefinite extension of the Treaty has left nuclear programmes and weapons outside the non-proliferation system: we are referring, here, to the Middle East region, the security and stability of which is an integral part of world peace and security.

The 1995 Review and Extension Conference provided a unique and historic opportunity to turn the Middle East region into a nuclear-weapon-free zone and a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction; it was an opportunity to which Israel did not respond by acceding to the Treaty. As a result, Syria would not agree to the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) unless Israel acceded to it and subjected its nuclear installations to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

Syria, which was among the first countries to accede to the Treaty and remains faithful to its obligations under it, cannot accept that Israel should remain outside this Treaty, particularly since it is common knowledge that Israel has a vast nuclear arsenal and continues to occupy large territories belonging to its neighbours and to act in defiance of international resolutions.

It is our hope that the forthcoming Review Conference will take these facts into consideration. Syria's position emanates from its rejection of Israel's possession of nuclear weapons. Such weapons pose a threat to the peace and stability of the region and of the entire world. We hope that the international community will reject Israel's position.

We affirm that despite our obligations, our clear commitment to the peace process and our active participation in bilateral talks in order to achieve just and comprehensive peace in the region, we will not accept the resolution on the Middle East region adopted at the Conference unless Israel subjects its nuclear installations to the IAEA safeguards system, in implementation of many General Assembly resolutions on this matter and Security Council resolution 487 (1981) which, *inter alia*, calls upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the IAEA, which has not yet occurred.

**Mr. Benítez** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution we have just adopted, contained in document A/C.1/51/L.3, because we consider the text basically a procedural one. As is well known, Cuba is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has expressed its views on the Treaty on many occasions.

Our vote in favour of this draft resolution, therefore, should in no way be interpreted as a change in our position on the Treaty.

**Mr. Elahi** (Pakistan): Pakistan voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3. In our view, the content of operative paragraphs 1 and 2, noting the decision of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to hold a Preparatory Committee meeting and requesting the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance, is unexceptionable and purely procedural. Our views on the NPT are well known, as is our position on the circumstances under which we can accede to that Treaty.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.15, contained in cluster 5.

**The Chairman:** If there are no general statements or explanations of vote before the voting, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.15, in cluster 5.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.15, "Regional confidence-building measures," was introduced by the representative of the Congo, on behalf of the States members of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security

Questions in Central Africa, at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996.

As announced by the representative of the Congo on 14 November, operative paragraph 14 of the draft resolution is to be revised as follows: the words "Reiterates its appeal" at the beginning of the paragraph should be replaced by the word "Appeals".

It should be noted that in connection with this draft resolution a statement of programme budget implications is contained in document A/C.1/51/L.52.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.15 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I call upon the representative of China, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China)(*interpretation from Chinese*): China is very much concerned about the peace, stability and development of Africa. Since the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa was established in 1992 its members have adopted a series of regional confidence-building measures to meet the specific conditions of the region and the problems facing it.

We appreciate those efforts and the results achieved. As the draft resolution notes, only confidence-building measures taken at the initiative and with the participation of all States concerned and taking into account the specific characteristics of each region, are effective. We are in favour of that approach, which applies specific remedies to specific illnesses so to speak.

On the basis of those considerations, the Chinese delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.15, "Regional confidence-building measures".

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1.

If there are no general statements or explanations of vote before the voting, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, was introduced by the representative of Ireland at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996. Document A/C.1/51/INF.3 contains the names of further sponsors in addition to those sponsors listed in the draft resolution.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

Turkey, United States of America

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted by 144 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Mauritius, Nigeria and Paraguay informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** I now call upon those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China)(*interpretation from Chinese*). The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament". China attaches great importance to the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. We welcomed the admission of 23 countries to membership of the Conference on Disarmament in June 1996, which fulfilled the aspirations those countries had entertained for many years and also injected new vitality into the Conference.

China has always believed that those countries should be full members of the Conference on Disarmament, with no strings attached, and participate on an equal footing with other members of the Conference. We also welcome the application of other countries for membership in the Conference. We hope that the Conference will continue to consider seriously the question of its further enlargement in accordance with the principle of equitable political and geographical representation.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): The United States abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, and we would like to put our concerns on the record.

We have not yet decided whether we support the idea of further expansion of the Conference on Disarmament, and we are concerned that the draft resolution could be misinterpreted as implying a firm deadline for the Conference to decide that question. As we all know, in June the Conference admitted 23 new countries, bringing the number of members to a new total of 61. The international community has not yet had sufficient time to evaluate the results of this expansion, and we are not certain it is wise to admit additional countries so soon.

By actively participating as observers, the countries applying for membership have given evidence of their strong interest in the Conference on Disarmament's work, and there are also good reasons to believe they would make useful contributions as States members of the Conference. On the other hand, it is vitally important that the Conference fulfil its key role by remaining a viable negotiating body. The Conference must not become so large as to be unwieldy.

In private discussions, the United States delegation put forward ways whereby the wording of operative paragraph 2 could have been adjusted in order to make it quite clear that the General Assembly was not attempting to establish a deadline for further action on expansion by the Conference on Disarmament. We regret it was not possible to reach agreement on such adjustments, and we cannot be confident that the Conference will be able to decide on further expansion during its 1997 session.

In practice, the Conference will take a decision on this question at an appropriate time. The wording of the draft resolution does not adequately reflect this, and that is why the United States found it necessary to abstain. On the other hand, the United States does agree that during the 1997 session the Conference on Disarmament should actively consider the question of possible further expansion and, in particular, the requests for admission by the remaining candidates.

**Mr. Uluçevik** (Turkey): My delegation shares the main thrust of the draft resolution just adopted. However, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, not because we wanted the door to be closed to the admission of new members, but because we have strong reservations as to one particular application for membership in the Conference on Disarmament.

**Mr. Berguño** (Chile)(*interpretation from Spanish*): We were pleased to support the draft resolution submitted by Ireland because we share the feelings of justice and equity that underlie the aspirations of the countries concerned. In particular, we wish to associate ourselves with our fraternal Latin American republics. We believe that the draft resolution contains no new element, but that it is structured in such a way as to remind the Conference on Disarmament of commitments undertaken earlier under General Assembly resolution 50/72. We trust that the Conference will give due consideration to applications for membership.

**Mr. Kadrakounov** (Kyrgyzstan): We believe that expansion of membership in the Conference on Disarmament provides a good opportunity for small countries to be involved in the process of decision-making on global issues.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 8.

I call upon the representative of Mexico to introduce draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7.

**Mr. De Icaza** (Mexico)(*interpretation from Spanish*): It is my understanding that I had already in fact introduced the draft decision. In any event, I believe I did refer to it during our earlier structural discussion.

As we are all aware, the question of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of their delivery systems in all its aspects calls for a joint approach and a comprehensive consideration by the international community. For several years now, my country has advocated a frank and constructive dialogue on this question in the General Assembly as well as in the Conference on Disarmament.

As a first step towards the establishment of such a dialogue, we proposed that the report submitted by the Secretary-General on this subject (A/INF/49/3) be considered by an intergovernmental group of experts, as requested in General Assembly resolution 48/75 C. We regret that the initiative did not bear fruit. This year we were not able to find time to hold consultations on the subject. Representatives are aware that in the Conference on Disarmament we were busy with another treaty and very intensive negotiations that left no room for other activities. Nevertheless, it is necessary at this stage to adapt to the new realities of the international disarmament agenda. We believe it appropriate to keep on the agenda of the First Committee the subject matter of the draft decision being introduced by my delegation for the second time.

We of course propose to hold consultations with all delegations over the next few months on the usefulness of considering comprehensively the issue of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. If we find a suitable response, we will put forward a concrete proposal to the General Assembly at its next session. Obviously, if we do not reach agreement in those consultations, we shall not submit an equivalent draft decision in the years to come. However, in the meantime we propose that this item be kept on the agenda.

**The Chairman:** If there are no general statements or explanations of vote before the voting, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7, on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 24th meeting of the Committee, on 15 November 1996.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta,

Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*The draft decision was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 53 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** If there are no general statements or explanations of position before action is taken, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1, contained in cluster 9.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996. In addition to those sponsors contained in the draft resolution and appearing in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, the draft resolution is sponsored by the Central African Republic and Gambia.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures". However, China believes that some of the concepts in the draft resolution could be further explored and discussed.

First, the definition and scope of small arms and light weapons has not been agreed upon. In these circumstances, we have no basis for dealing with such issues as the collection, acquisition, production, transfer and control of these types of weapons.

The second question is the relationship between transparency in armaments and security. China believes that the appropriate transparency measures may help increase mutual trust and confidence-building between countries. However, countries vary in size, strength and specific national conditions. The kind of international and regional security environment in which they live, along with the corresponding need for armaments, also differs from country to country. Therefore, the same transparency measures will have a different impact upon different countries. Thus, to say in general terms that an enhanced level of transparency will contribute to confidence-building and security between States does not give a full picture of the issue.

Although China has a different interpretation of some of the language in draft resolution A/51/L.38/Rev.1, we joined the consensus on this draft resolution because we understand that the main thrust of this draft resolution is to maintain and consolidate peace and security through practical measures in countries in conflict and that, generally speaking, this is in keeping with the interests of the countries concerned.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): It is not the normal practice of the United States to endorse draft resolutions in the First Committee which provide a blanket request for the Secretary-General to develop suggestions and recommendations in a particular field. Rather, the United States maintains that Member States themselves or organizations in which they participate generally develop such suggestions and recommendations.

In the disarmament field, I would point to such bodies as the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee itself. These bodies are the ones which formulate and agree on suggestions and recommendations on disarmament matters and forward them to United Nations Members for consideration.

Having said this, the United States has decided to make an exception for A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1. This draft resolution is too important not to encourage continued work both by Member States and by the Secretary-General and his staff. The United States attaches great importance to the issues raised in A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1, such as small arms, light weapons, confidence-building measures, demining, conversion and arms transfers. The United States urges the

Secretary-General to take into account the views of Member States when he develops his suggestions and recommendations, as specified in operative paragraph 3. The United States, for one, will be providing its views in the coming year, as requested in operative paragraph 4. We look forward to continued work in this field and express appreciation to the German delegation and the sponsors of A/C.1/51/L.38/Rev.1 for introducing this new draft resolution.

**Mr. De Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico voted in favour of this draft resolution despite having some difficulties with it.

First of all, the title does not correspond to the content. The content refers to certain concrete disarmament measures in zones that have suffered the consequences of conflicts, while the title refers only to the consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures. I would like to reiterate that there are many disarmament measures that can and should be applied to consolidate peace, not just those referred to in the draft resolution.

Secondly, my delegation has on other occasions expressed my Government's reservations regarding the reports of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" and "Supplement to an Agenda for Peace". In the same vein, as regards operative paragraph 3, my delegation is of the view that it is up to the existing United Nations forums for this purpose to make recommendations and suggestions in disarmament measures, not the Secretary-General.

Lastly, I cannot fail to state that my delegation was not very pleased with revised Protocol II to the 1980 Convention, and it is therefore difficult for us to welcome, as does the last preambular paragraph, the adoption of that Protocol.

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): Egypt joined the consensus on this draft resolution, and we underline the fact that we support the initiative, and the genesis of the initiative, introduced by the German delegation to this body. I would also like to seize the opportunity to thank Germany for introducing this draft resolution.

However, I would like to highlight certain points that we think need to be refined in future efforts, one of which is the mention of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects in the last preambular paragraph of this draft resolution. This reference, in the view of my delegation, is not consonant with what seems to be the thrust of the draft resolution, which is contained in operative paragraph 1: small arms and light weapons.

A few other points need to be fine-tuned. Operative paragraph 1 mentions practical disarmament measures; we wonder what the definition of practicality is. It mentions small arms and light weapons without any mention of the definition and scope of what we really mean by small arms and light weapons. Operative paragraph 3

> *requests* the Secretary-General, in the light of experience gained from conflict resolution...",

and the correct reference, in the view of my delegation, would have been to peacekeeping operations in which the United Nations was involved.

Finally, operative paragraph 5 refers to regional arrangements or agencies without really defining what "agencies" really means or entails.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/51/L.22 and draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, both in cluster 10.

I shall first call on those representatives who wish to make general statements.

**Mr. Čalovski** (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): I would like to make a few brief comments and clarifications in connection with yesterday's observations on A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 by the Ambassadors of Mexico, China and Pakistan.

I listened very carefully. I took note of their observations, and I think that they are relevant. I am sure that all the sponsors of A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 thought the same. We appreciate their comments very much, and I assure them that we are going to take them into account in the follow-up activities under this draft resolution. I was particularly happy to have their positive appreciation and understanding of our initiative. I was very happy to hear that, in fact, they have not expressed objections to the actual text of A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

The representative of China, for conceptual reasons, would prefer that the paragraph on the obligation of Member States to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, be dealt

with in the resolutions of the Third Committee, not in the First Committee.

The representative of Pakistan, in order to help find a solution, suggested the possible addition of a paragraph which would recall the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations, the Declaration on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations and some other relevant United Nations declarations.

The representative of Mexico expressed the wish, shared by the Ambassador of Pakistan, to add a reference to the obligation of States to respect the principle of self-determination of peoples. He also drew our attention to the mandates of the organizations mentioned in the preambular part of the draft resolution.

As I have said, all these observations are relevant, and we have no problem with them as such.

In the process of drafting A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, we made the maximum effort to produce a draft that could be adopted by consensus. We made special efforts to produce a draft which could be sponsored by all five permanent members of the Security Council, taking into account the Charter obligation of the Council in preventive activities of the United Nations.

My delegation is particularly happy that four permanent members of the Security Council — France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States — have joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

We struggled to find a way for China, as a permanent member of the Security Council, to be a sponsor of the draft resolution. We do understand very well why China cannot do so, and we fully respect its position.

As is well known, the prevention of violent conflicts and of the violent disintegration of States is a very complex matter and is very topical at present, particularly in our region, as well as in other regions of the world.

It is not easy to draft a perfect text on such a complex subject. We tried to draft a reasonably good one. In essence, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 is a procedural draft resolution, a follow-up to the resolution on good-neighbourliness adopted last year by the First Committee.

In our opinion, good-neighbourliness and prevention of destruction are essential prerequisites for the development of healthy international relations.

My understanding is that the Ambassador of Mexico did not ask for a vote on A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, and neither did my friend the Ambassador of Pakistan. I was not quite clear about the position of the Ambassador of China. My understanding is that he expressed the wish for a separate vote on, not a deletion of, a part of preambular paragraph 4, and that he did not request a separate vote on the draft resolution as a whole. However, perhaps my understanding is not correct.

In the opinion of all the sponsors of the draft resolution, taking into account the complexity of the subject and its topical character, the best way to proceed will be to adopt A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 without a vote. That would send an important message: that we are unanimously against all forces of destruction and that we are dedicated to our commitment, under the Charter, to prevent the eruption of violent conflicts which may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

**Mr. De Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to thank the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for the statement that he has just made.

In fact, we do not have a problem with the draft resolution that he introduced as regards specific situations. Unfortunately, the draft resolution is drafted in terms of general, global application, and in that respect my delegation cannot accept the primacy given the principle of territorial integrity of States at the expense of the validity and importance my country attaches to the principles of non-intervention and self-determination of peoples. My delegation will be obliged to request a recorded vote on this draft resolution and will abstain in the voting.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China) *(interpretation from Chinese):* The Chinese delegation listened carefully to the statement of the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

In a general statement yesterday, my delegation enunciated its position on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. In that statement, the Chinese delegation pointed out that its views differ from those expressed in the fourth preambular paragraph.

We held extensive consultations on this question with the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. For various reasons, China's proposal has not been accepted, for which we wish to express our regret.

In China's general statement yesterday, we also stated our views on violent and non-violent disintegration. I stressed that China is against any form of disintegration, whether violent or peaceful. Because we hold a different view on the two questions mentioned above, my delegation yesterday requested a recorded vote on A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, and not a separate vote.

My delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution. We hope that the questions raised by the Chinese delegation, particularly in connection with the fourth preambular paragraph, will be addressed and that the draft resolution will be improved upon so that the Chinese delegation will be able to fully support it if it is put forward again next year, at the fifty-second session of the General Assembly.

**The Chairman:** If there are no explanations of vote before the voting, we will proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/51/L.22.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/51/L.22, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Colombia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Draft decision A/C.1/51/L.22 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 51 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

I call on the representative of Ukraine for an explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Horin** (Ukraine): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 is of the utmost importance to the international community as a whole and

to the new and restored democracies in particular. It reaffirms the basic principles of international law, among them the principles of the inviolability of borders among States and the territorial integrity of any State, which enhances the main tenets of international peace and security and helps prevent the violent disintegration of States.

The delegation of Ukraine supports the general thrust of the draft resolution, affirming the need for United Nations measures to help prevent the violent disintegration of States. It is the deep conviction of my delegation that the time has come to consider the establishment of United Nations monitoring of the formation processes of new States, aimed at making the use of force inadmissible and at promoting adhering to the established standards of international law.

My delegation would like to become a sponsor of this draft resolution.

**The Chairman**: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to those sponsors contained in the draft resolution and those appearing in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, the following countries are also sponsors: Albania, Ecuador and Ukraine.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

Algeria, China, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Pakistan, United Republic of Tanzania

*Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

**The Chairman**: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

**Mrs. Fritsche** (Liechtenstein): My delegation wishes to explain its vote regarding draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, which was just adopted. Since we fully agree with the main thrust of this draft resolution, which underlines the importance of activities of the United Nations and relevant regional organizations aimed at the prevention of the violent disintegration of States, we voted in favour of this text. I would like to express my appreciation to the delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for its initiative.

We are, however, of the view that the text of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 could have contained additional elements which would have made this draft resolution more balanced and substantial. While the text, as just adopted, contains a reference to the obligations of States to develop friendly relations among nations, it fails to quote General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), which is a crucial text in this context, a reference to which would have struck a clearer balance with operative paragraph 4 of the text.

Furthermore, my delegation welcomes the reference to Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter in the fourth preambular paragraph, but we are also of the view that this draft resolution should address the question of the root causes which lead to attempts at the violent disintegration of States, since this matter is clearly of the utmost importance for designing preventive measures, as called for in the draft resolution.

**Mr. Berguño** (Chile)(*interpretation from Spanish*): While we agree with many of the comments made on the drafting flaws of the text, we agree with the basic thrust of the draft resolution. It affirms the importance of territorial integrity and the boundaries of States and the maintenance of actions to prevent the violent disintegration of States. We appreciatively take note of the sponsors' desire to correct the shortcomings of form in the follow-up to the draft resolution.

**Mr. Mesdoua** (Algeria)(*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States".

My delegation believes that all States must respect the principles of the United Nations Charter, reject the use of force to resolve conflicts and to avoid interference in the internal affairs of other States. My country has always endorsed respect for the territorial integrity and inviolability of internationally recognized borders ensuing from colonialism and has always and in all circumstances defended the principle of self-determination, which has been obscured in this draft resolution, but which is embodied in a number of international texts and instruments, in particular in resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. That text also contains legal imbalances that my delegation could not endorse. My delegation remains convinced that this draft resolution can be considered outside of the First Committee.

I heard with great interest the comments made by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and, in particular, that his delegation and the other sponsors will in the future, especially at the fifty-third session, study carefully the observations made yesterday by some delegations and take the necessary corrective measures.

I assure the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia that I will communicate his observations to my authorities. In the meantime, my delegation cannot support the draft resolution and therefore abstained in the voting.

**Mr. Sebulime** (Uganda): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 principally because it emphasizes well-known principles that we hold dear.

However, we believe that this draft resolution in its entirety is unbalanced. It presupposes that most of the disintegration of States has been caused by the interference of other States in their internal affairs. We cannot disagree more with this view.

There are other factors that bring about the disintegration of States, and on many occasions these factors are domestic, they are internal. I believe that those who have read the Secretary-General's report on perspectives on the medium-term plan know that other factors, such as marginalization of particular sections of society within States, intolerance within States and above all the phenomenon of State intolerance within States is crucial and fundamental to the disintegration of many States. To ignore some of these factors is to make a half-hearted attempt to solve the problem. So we believe that in the follow-up action of the sponsors and the United Nations these other factors that we have mentioned will have to be given due regard.

**Mr. Hasan** (Iraq): My delegation supports the noble goal of this draft resolution. We hope that all States refrain from attempts to bring about the disintegration of independent States for their illegitimate interests. Unfortunately, we are witnessing attempts by a super-Power, ironically a sponsor of this draft resolution — namely, the United States — to cause the disintegration of my country, Iraq, through the use of force, by imposing no-fly zones and arming and supporting rebel groups, and other illegal and violent means. We hope that the adoption of this draft resolution will help prevent such attempts, especially by States with certain responsibilities for preserving international peace and security.

**Mr. García** (Colombia)(*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States", despite some flaws in the language of the draft resolution. However, we voted in favour because we agree on the main objective, which is to contribute to preventing the disintegration of States while at the same time reiterating the principles of the Charter of the United Nations regarding, in particular, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and, in general, respect for the principles and norms of international law.

**Mr. Sáenz** (Costa Rica)(*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to explain Costa Rica's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. Costa Rica's position is very similar to that expressed by the representative of Mexico. However, I would like to make clear that Costa Rica, as a disarmed country, is opposed to the violent disintegration of any State and maintains that if any State must be dissolved, it should be through peaceful means. Nevertheless, the draft resolution put forward does not reflect complete respect for the self-determination of States.

**The Chairman:** We have exhausted the agenda items for today, so I shall now call on those representatives who wish to introduce draft resolutions or amendments.

**Mr. Lamazière** (Brazil): Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.4/Rev.1 adopted last 13 November, my delegation has noted some imprecisions in the Spanish and French translations, in title and again in operative paragraph 6. My delegation proposes that the Spanish and French versions be kept in line with the original English, and with the meaning and the intent of the resolution, in the title and in operative paragraph 6.

My delegation requests that this be reflected in the record and in the future consideration of the draft resolution in plenary.

**The Chairman**: The Secretariat will take note of the observations of the representative of Brazil.

**Mr. Rivasseau** (France) (*interpretation from French*): I am a bit annoyed on this point because I do not think that the English version should necessarily be the one regarded as legitimate. I believe we have to think about the actual intention of the sponsors. If the representative of Brazil, as a sponsor, considers that the translation into French should be as he suggests, I thank him and I would not presume to question his being more qualified than francophone delegations to make such a judgement. However, I think perhaps he should have asked the francophone delegations whether they agree. I would like to emphasize that just because the English version is drafted in a certain way, we should not automatically alter the other versions, which are equally valid.

**Mr. Mesdoua** (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My country is one of the sponsors, and I have been working on the French version. Ours was one of the delegations that asked at the outset to have the title amended, as proposed by the Brazilian delegation, because, rather than being a question merely of wording, this could have a considerable substantive effect.

**The Chairman:** I am sure this problem will be resolved, and I ask the Secretariat to take note of this question.

I now call on the representative of Poland to introduce an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.48.

**Mr. Dembinski** (Poland): On behalf of Canada, India, Mexico and Poland, which are the sponsors of A/C.1/51/L.48, I would like to introduce the following amendment. The sponsors propose to introduce a new operative paragraph 6, reading as follows:

"*Urges* the Preparatory Commission for the Organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons to intensify efforts to complete its remaining work".

The present operative paragraph 6 would become operative paragraph 7.

It is the understanding of the sponsors that if this amended text of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.48 is adopted without a vote, the Islamic Republic of Iran will withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.49.

I ask the Secretariat to issue a new version of the text as A/C.1/51/L.48/Rev.1, and I ask that action be taken on this on Monday.

**The Chairman:** The members of the Committee take note of this proposed amendment. I ask the representative of Poland to transmit the proposed amendment to the Secretariat.

**Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to endorse the statement made by the representative of Poland. If the amended draft resolution entitled, "Status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", contained in document A/C.1/51/L.48/Rev.1 is adopted without a vote, my delegation will withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.49.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will take note of the statement of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): After consultations with interested delegations, I should like, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.1, to announce that we are about to give the Secretariat a new version of the draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.2, which will have the following changes. The first amendment is to the second preambular paragraph, the new wording of which reads as follows:

(*spoke in English*)

> "*Recalling also* that, there being a consensus to do so in each case, three special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were held in 1978, 1982 and 1988, respectively".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

The new sixth preambular paragraph is virtually the same as before. Just one new word has been added in the first line. That new paragraph reads:

(*spoke in English*)

> "*Taking note* of the interim report of the 1996 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on the item entitled 'Exchange of views on the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament'".

The new word is "interim", which appears immediately after the words "Taking note of the".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

The other changes are to the operative part of the text, and I shall read them out as they will appear in A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.2. Paragraphs 1 to 3 read:

(*spoke in English*)

> "1. *Decides*, subject to the emergence of a consensus on its objectives and agenda, to convene its fourth special session devoted to disarmament in 1999;
>
> "2. *Notes* the view of the Secretary-General that preparations for the special session could begin in 1997;
>
> "3. *Decides*, subject to the outcome of deliberations concerning the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament at the 1997 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, to convene a meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament before the end of the fifty-first session of the Assembly in order to set an exact date and to decide on organizational matters relating to the convening of the special session, and to submit its progress report to the Assembly at its fifty-second session".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Paragraph 4 remains the same as in A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.1. Paragraph 5 reads as follows:

(*spoke in English*)

> "*Decides* to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-second session an item entitled 'Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament' and, subject to the outcome of deliberations at the 1997 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission to take up the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament."

(*spoke in Spanish*)

As I said, I will provide the Secretariat with a text immediately.

**The Chairman:** I thank the representative of Colombia for introducing the amendments to the draft resolution, and I ask him to present the amendments to the Secretariat in written form so that they will be reflected in the revised draft resolution.

**Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to place on record the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3, on the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee, and on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, on the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3 does not specify the purposes of the Preparatory Committee. On the basis of understandings reached in consultations on the draft resolution in question, we take it that this meeting, to be held in April 1997, will consider all substantive and procedural aspects of the Treaty and the 2000 Review Conference, in accordance with article VIII, paragraph 3, of the Treaty, as well as with the decisions taken at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in particular decision 1 on strengthening the review process for the Treaty, which, *inter alia*, elaborates the purposes of the review process and the Preparatory Committee.

To ensure the success of the review process, we recommend that appropriate prior consultations among the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) precede the work of the Preparatory Committee of the 2000 Review Conference.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, on the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, my delegation acknowledges the right of each Member State to be represented in disarmament forums. However, since the Conference on Disarmament has recently been expanded, we believe that we should allow the new political balance in membership to operate for a while before we embark upon a new attempt to expand it further. The Conference on Disarmament is a negotiating body. To change its membership rapidly every now and then, or even to make it an open-ended body, would have adverse effects on its functioning.

**The Chairman:** Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to remind members that on Monday, we will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.27/Rev.2, A/C.1/51/L.28/Rev.2, A/C.1/51/L.48/Rev.1, A/C.1/51/L.49 and, in cluster 7, A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.2. I would like to ask interested delegations to continue their consultations. If my assistance is needed, I am at members' disposal. I hope that we will be able to bring our work on taking decisions on draft resolutions to a successful conclusion next week.

I have received a request to extend the deadline for submission of draft resolutions under agenda item 62, "Question of Antarctica", until 20 November at 6 p.m. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that request.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.*